

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1-5 have been amended and no claim has been added or cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-10 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1 and 4 are independent claims. Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 2, 3, 5 and 6 contain allowable subject matter.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments do not add new matter to the application since the amendments were made solely for clarification purposes. In view of the above amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claims 1-3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserted “it is not clear as to which “converted IP information” is being transmitted in part (c) of claim 1. Also, it is not clear as to which “converted information” is being stored or transmitted in part (e) of the claim 1” (Office Action, Page 2).

In this response, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that (i) the first IP information converted in the standard form is transmitted to research center personal computers (PCs) in the step (c) and (ii) the second IP information converted in the standard form is transmitted to the research center PCs.

This amendment is made for the sole purpose of clarifying claim 1. This amendment is not made for the purpose of avoiding prior art or narrowing the claimed invention, and no change

in claim scope is intended. Therefore, Applicants do not intend to relinquish any subject matter by these amendments. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as amended, fully complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection of claims 1-3.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 4 and 7-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,038,561 issued to Snyder, et al. (“Snyder”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 recites:

“A method for analyzing and utilizing intellectual property (IP) information, comprising steps of:

- ...
- (b) *accessing and searching Internet websites that provide IP information based on the registered search strategy formulas, and extracting first IP information according to the search;*
 - (c) *converting the first IP information to a standard form and storing the first IP information, and transmitting the first IP information converted in the standard form to research center personal computers (PCs);*
 - (d) *determining whether a request for detailed information has been made from the research center PCs, and in the case where such a request is made, accessing the Internet websites and extracting second IP information corresponding to the first IP information; and*
 - (e) *converting the second IP information to a standard form and storing and transmitting the second IP information converted in the standard form to the research center PCs.”*

Here, claim 1 recites processing steps comprising (a) accessing and searching internet websites to extract the first IP information and (b) accessing the websites again to extract the

second IP information, when a request for more detailed information is made. Thus, the claimed invention involves two steps of accessing the website.

In this regard, the Examiner asserted that Snyder discloses the claimed steps of accessing the websites *twice* for the first IP information and the second information if a request for more detailed information is made, particularly in column 11, lines 7-20 (FIG. 9B) and column 25, lines 60 to column 26, line 21. This assertion is respectfully disagreed with.

First, it is submitted that the searching steps described in column 25, lines 60 to column 26, line 21 of Snyder is not performed subjected to the searching steps described in column 11, lines 7-20 (FIG. 9B). There is no concept of requesting detailed information for the IP information previously searched and extracted from the websites. Thus, it would not be possible for Snyder to disclose or suggest accessing internet website *twice* when a request for detailed information is made. If the Examiner wishes to maintain the position that Snyder discloses this claimed feature, the Examiner is respectfully requested to provide with logical and detailed explanation as to how and where in Snyder discloses this claimed feature.

Also, it is submitted that there is no concept of searching *internet websites* for IP information. Rather, Snyder assumes that the data storage 35 in FIG. 1A is internal to the document information text management and analysis system. Snyder does not disclose or even suggest accessing internet websites that stores a vast amount of information but still provides very individualized service *for free*. Thus, the present invention completely eliminates the time and costs for maintaining the data storage 35 of Snyder up to date.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over Snyder. Claims 2 and 3 that are dependent from claim 1 would be also patentable at least for the same reason.

Amended independent claim 4 recites “an E-mail receiving/transmitting unit for ... *receiving feedback of data containing opinion contents from the research center PCs*”. An example of this claimed feature is shown in FIG. 2 of the present application, which shows the analyzed technology and prepare opinion contents from the research center analyzing unit 500 to the IP information analyzing unit 300 via *the E-mail receiving/transmitting unit 400*.

It is submitted that Snyder fails to disclose this claimed feature. This is further evidenced by the fact that the Office Action is silent as to how and where in Snyder discloses or teaches this claimed feature. Thus, it is submitted that claim 4 is patentable over Snyder. Claims 7-10 that are dependent from claim 4 would be also patentable at least for the same reason.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claims 1, 4 and 7-10.

Other Matters

In the Office Action, claims 5 and 6 have been objected to for being dependent from the rejected base claim. This objection is respectfully traversed because independent claim 4 is now believed to be patentable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: October 30, 2003

McGuireWoods LLP
1750 Tysons Boulevard
Suite 1800
McLean, VA 22102-4215
Tel: 703-712-5365
Fax: 703-712-5280
HCP:WSC/kbs

\COM\217787.1